REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on May 10, 2010. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the foregoing amendment in light of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed on May 10, 2010, Claims 1-5 and 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. PG-Pub No. 2003/0014368 to Leurig (hereinafter referred to as "Leurig") in view of U.S. PG-Pub No. 2003/0172148 to Simpson (hereinafter referred to as "Simpson"). No other issues were raised.

Status of the Application

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 13 and 16 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 8-17 remain pending in the application.

Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 8-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Leurig and Simpson

Claims 1-5 and 8-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Leurig and Simpson (*see, e.g.,* pages 2-11 of Office Action). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is not obvious over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson, because the references do not teach or suggest a method executed by a server capable of communicating with a client device and a printer device through a network, *the*

server, the client device and the printer device each being a different apparatus from the other, the method comprising:

"receiving a printing request from the client device;

transmitting print data to the printer device selected in the client device in accordance with the received printing request;

transmitting, to the client device, address information for causing the client device *to access the printer device and acquire, from the printer device without going through the server, a Web page provided by the printer device, the Web page displaying a state of processing of the transmitted print data*; and

allowing the client device to access the printer device and display the Web page in accordance with the address information" (emphasis added), as recited in the claim.

According to embodiments of the method as claimed, the server transmits print data to a printer device that has been selected in a client device, in accordance with a received printing request, with *the server, the client device and the printer device each being a different apparatuses*. The server also transmits address information to the client device to *cause the client device to access the printer device, without going through the server*, and to *acquire a Web page* therefrom that *displays a state or processing of the transmitted print data* (*see, e.g.,* paragraph [0055] of publication of instant application). The client device is then allowed to access the printer device and display the Web page in accordance with the address information (*see, e.g.* Fig. 6 and paragraphs [0055]-[0056] of the publication of the instant application). The method as claimed thus allows the client to acquire the state of processing of the transmitted print data *via the Web page*, and *without requiring any prior registration of the address*

information of the printer by a user, since the address information for causing the client device to access the printer device and *acquire the Web page therefrom* is transmitted to the client device by the server (*see, e.g.,* paragraph [0055] of publication of instant application). Embodiments of the method as claimed may thus reduce the workload on a server, because the server is not required to transmit the state of printing to the client device, but rather the client device is allowed to obtain the state of printing directly from the Web page acquired from the printer device.

The method of claim 1 is patentable over the teachings of Leurig, because Leurig does not teach or suggest a method in which address information is transmitted to a client device *to cause the client device to acquire a Web page that displays a printing state from a printer device, without going through a server*, and also does not teach or suggest a method in which the client device is *allowed to access the printer device and display the Web page* in accordance with instructions. That Leurig fails to teach or suggest steps in the claimed method is even *admitted* in the Office Action, which states that "Leurig does not disclose transmitting to the client device address information for get[ting] the state of the print data and displaying the state in accordance with the address information" (page 3 of Office Action, first full paragraph).

Leurig teaches a secure system for printing negotiable instruments using a central server that authorizes the printing (*see, e.g.,* Abstract). Leurig teaches that a client computer 108 communicates with a printer to print the negotiable instrument, and that "[a]fter printing is complete, printer 110 provides a status response (step 322) to client system 108" (lines 9-11 of paragraph [0048]). Thus,

as was discussed in the previous Responses as well as in the interview with the Examiner on August 12, 2009, Leurig teaches that a client computer communicates directly with a printer to get status information, but Leurig does not teach or suggest transmitting *address information* (*e.g.,* web address information) *to the client computer from a server* to cause the client computer to access the printer and acquire the Web page with print status information therefrom.

Instead, Leurig teaches that the server acts to verify that a client computer is authorized to print on a particular printer (*see, e.g.,* paragraph [0046]), such as by requesting a serial number or other identifying information from the printer (*see, e.g.,* paragraph [0046]). If it is determined that the client computer is authorized, then the server also *transmits a data file including a print job* to the client computer (*see, e.g.,* paragraphs [0047]-[0048]), with the client computer then providing the file to the printer for printing. However, nowhere in any of these transmissions does Leurig teach or suggest that that *address information is transmitted to the client computer from the server* to cause the client to access and acquire a Web page from the printer. Indeed, it is considered that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the user would instead need to *preliminarily register* such address information to obtain status information from the printer on the client computer, according to the system of Leurig, as the address information is not otherwise taught as being transmitted to the client computer.

It can be further understood from viewing the figures of Leurig why it would *not* be necessary to provide the transmission of address information from a server to a client computer in the system of Leurig, to cause the client

computer to acquire print status information. This is because, as seen for example in Figs. 2-3 of Leurig, the printer 110 appears to be directly connected to the client computer 108, as opposed to having the client computer being connected to the printer via an intermediary server. Thus, the system of Leurig has no need for providing address information to the client computer to *circumvent an intermediary server*, and obtain direct communications between the client computer and printer, because the printer and client computer are *already directly connected*.

Furthermore, as Leurig does not teach or suggest transmitting address information to a client device to cause the device to access the printer and acquire a Web page without going through a server, it follows therefrom that Leurig also does not teach or suggest *allowing the client device to access the printer device and display the Web page with the printing state in accordance with the address information*. Accordingly, the method of claim 1 is not obvious over the teachings of Leurig.

Simpson does not make up for the deficiencies of Leurig. Simpson teaches a printing system having a client computer and a printer that allows a user of the computer to download Web content provided by the printer (*see, e.g.,* Abstract). In particular, Simpson teaches that "the printer 106 includes an embedded Web server (print server) 132" (paragraph [0036]), which embedded Web server 132 serves a program that provides print service (PS) Web content 136 to enable a client to print a document (*see, e.g.,* paragraphs [0036]-[0037]). Thus, Simpson teaches a Web server 132 that is *embedded in*, i.e. is integrated with, a printer 106, but does not teach or suggest transmitting address

information from *a Web server that is a separate apparatus from the printer*, as is required by the method of the instant claim.

Simpson further teaches that the PS Web content 136 is capable of displaying a web page (e.g., "help page") including a hyperlink (e.g., "help link") (*see, e.g.,* paragraphs [0054]-[0055]), which a user can select to "obtain assistance to resolve the printer alert condition that has occurred" (paragraph [0054]), such as for example by launching an e-mail dialog box with an individual who can provide assistance (*see, e.g.,* paragraph [0057]). Thus, Simpson teaches providing a hyperlink (e.g., helplink) that includes address information (i.e., a web address) *for accessing the Web server 132*, and which may be selected by a user to *obtain assistance in resolving an alert condition of a printer*. However, Simpson does not teach or suggest *transmitting address information* for causing the client device to *access the printer* and to *acquire a Web page displaying a state of processing of the transmitted print data therefrom*, because Simpson does not teach or suggest that the helplink provides such address information for accessing and acquiring a Web page from the printer. In other words, while Simpson teaches that a Web server 132 transmits a hyperlink to a client 104 *for accessing the Web server 132 itself*, Simpson does not teach or suggest that the Web server 132 transmits address information *to cause the client 104 to access the printer 106*, let alone to *acquire a Web page from the printer 106*, as in the method as claimed.

Furthermore, since the Web server 132 of Simpson is integrated with the printer 106 and manages all of the statuses of the printer 106, the client 104 can obtain print status information by accessing the Web server 132. Accordingly, it

is considered that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious
to modify the teachings of Simpson to provide address information to the client _to
cause the client 104 to access the printer and acquire a Web page therefrom_, as
in the method as claimed, because such information can be obtained via the Web
server 132 in the system of Simpson.

Accordingly, as neither Leurig nor Simpson teach or suggest the method
as claimed that includes _transmitting address information_ for causing the client
device to _access a printer device and acquire a Web page displaying a state of
processing of the transmitted print data_, and _allowing the client device to display
the Web page in accordance with the address information_, it is considered that
claim 1 is patentable over the combined teachings of the references. Claims 2-5
depend from claim 1, and thus are also patentable over the references for at
least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claim 8 is directed to an information processing device capable of
communicating with an external device and a printer device through a network,
_the information processing device, the external device and the printer device
each being a different apparatus from the other_, the information processing
device comprising:

"a request receiving unit configured to receive a printing request from the
external device;

a data transmission unit configured to transmit print data to the printer
device selected in the external device in accordance with the printing request
received by the request receiving unit;

a transmission unit configured to transmit, to the external device, address

information for causing the external device to _access the printer device and_
acquire, from the printer device without going through the information processing
apparatus, a Web page provided by the printer device, the Web page displaying
a state of processing of the print data transmitted by the data transmission unit;
and

a control unit _configured to allow the external device to access the printer_
device and display the Web page in accordance with the address information"
(emphasis added)

Thus, the information processing device as recited in claim 8 may be
capable of performing steps that are the same as and/or similar to those
performed in the method of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is considered to be
patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for reasons that are the
same as and/or similar to those discussed above for claim 1, and in particular as
neither of the references teaches or suggests a transmission unit that _transmits_
address information for causing the external device to _access a printer and_
acquire a Web page displaying a state of processing of the transmitted print data,
nor a control unit that causes the external device to _access the printer device and_
display the Web page in accordance with the address information. Claims 9-12
depend from claim 8, and thus are also patentable over the teachings of Leurig
and Simpson for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Claim 13 is directed to a computer-readable medium having a program
stored thereon for controlling a computer of a server capable of communicating
with an external device and a printer device, the external device, server and
printer device each being a different apparatus from the other, the program

causing the computer to execute a method that is the same as and/or similar to the method of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 13 is considered to be patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and in particular as the references do not teach or suggest _transmitting address information_ for causing the external device to _access a printer and acquire a Web page displaying a state of processing of the transmitted print data,_ and _allowing the external device to access the printer and display the Web page in accordance with the address information,_ as in the claim. Claims 14-17 depend from claim 13, and thus are also patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson for at least the same reasons as their base claim.

Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 8-17 are patentable over the teachings of Leurig and Simpson, and the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over these references is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

10/11/2010   /Abigail Cotton/

Date   Abigail Cotton, Reg. No. 52,773
                                              Patent Agent for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3351
Fax: (949) 932-3560